Remarks

The Examiner's reconsideration of the application is urged in view of the amendments above and comments which follow.

The following Claim Chart explains the correspondence between the claims above and the former claims.

CLAIM CHART

New Claims	Former Claims
1	1 (amended)
24	24 (amended)
25	3
26	4
27	5
28	6
29	7
30	8
31	9
32	10
33	11
34	22

I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office action, page 2, point 2, claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112 because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the image upscaling or downscaling". This rejection is addressed by shifting claim 24 to the position of first dependent claim and making new claim 25 (corresponding to cancelled claim 3) dependent on new claim 24.

In the Office Action, page 2, point 3, claims 1 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC § 112 because the term "suitable for performing calculations/image upscaling" used in these claims is relative term which renders the claim indefinite. This rejection is addressed by deleting the words "is suitable for" in the claims 1 and 24 so that the claims now read:

- in claim 1: "...so that each emissive display tile assembly is handling a different portion of the image for performing real-time calculations..." and

"... the distributed processing means performs real-time calculations"

- in claim 24: "...wherein the distributed processing means is further performs image upscaling or downscaling...".

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office action, page 2, point 5, claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok (U.S. Patent No 6,999,045) in view of Matthies (U.S. Patent No 6,498,592). (Apparently there is a clerical error in the numbers of the claims given under point 5 of the O.A., claim 7 being rejected in point 6 on page 5 and claim 8 being rejected under point 5, page 4, last paragraph).

In amended claim 1, the feature :"wherein the distributed processing means performs real-time calculations for the various pixels of the correspondent display assembly in relation with the ON-time, the light output and the lifetime correction of these pixels" has been replaced by :" wherein the distributed processing means performs real-time calculations of the lifetime of the pixels of the correspondent display tile." This is based on the specification, page 34, lines 4.

Lifetime is an important data, in particular for tiled displays, extending over larger surfaces. It may be difficult to detect quickly badly functioning emissive elements in such displays, with as a possible consequence a poor image on the display. Lifetime is a very effective data that can be used in timely replacement of emissive devices or even complete tiles.

In reference to claim 1, it is clear from the Office Action, page 3, that "the processing suitable for calculations for the various pixels of the correspondent display tile assembly in relation with the ON time, light output and the lifetime correction of these pixels" (corresponding to the final feature of claim 1) is not disclosed by Cok. From this statement it can be deducted directly that the new feature relating to the real-time calculations of the lifetime of the pixels is also not disclosed in Cok.

In the Office Action, page 3, the Examiner further states that :

"Matthies discloses the tiled emissive display (Fig. 1) wherein the distributed processing means (Fig. 2) for performing calculations for the various pixels of the correspondent display tile assembly in relation with the on time, light output and the lifetime correction of these pixels (col. 9, lines 7-11 and col. 10, lines 40-60)."

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Matthies discloses the adjustment of pixel brightness by using methods based on the measurement of the current brightness (see e.g. col. 10, lines 54-65) but Matthies is silent about the real-time calculation of lifetime or lifetime corrections of pixels. The feature relating to the real-time calculation of lifetime of pixels is also not disclosed in Ogino.

Therefore, the feature:" wherein the distributed processing means is performing real-time calculations of the lifetime of the pixels of the correspondent display tile" is not disclosed in the prior art.

Claim 1 is thus not anticipated by the cited prior art. The prior art does not contain any indication or hint pointing at such a feature.

Furthermore, it is submitted that, at the time the invention was made, amended claim 1 was also non-obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

New claims 25-28 (corresponding to claims 3-6), 30-33 (corresponding to claims 8-11), 34 (corresponding to claim 22) and 24 are claims depending on claim 1. These claims are thus submitted to also be novel and non-obvious.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office action, page 5, point 6, claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok (U.S. Patent No 6,999,045) and Matthies (U.S. Patent No 6,498,592) in view of Ogino et al. (US Patent No 6,791,513).

New claim 29 (corresponding to claim 7) is dependent on an amended claim 1 which is submitted to be allowable. Claim 29 is thus also submitted to be allowable.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and such action is requested.

An appropriate Petition for Extension of Time is also submitted herewith.

February 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26935
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 – Fax